

No. 186 APRIL 1984

*Spearhead*

50p



**COAL CHAOS**

**A FAILURE OF  
GOVERNMENT**

(See pages 2 & 3)



Nationalist comment

# WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

## Coal chaos

The recent trouble in Britain's coalfields must be seen as encompassing two entirely separate issues, not one single issue, as it has been the habit of many to portray it. On the one hand there is the issue of the rightness or wrongness of the Government-backed National Coal Board in closing down certain pits judged to be 'uneconomic'; on the other hand there is the question of the violence and intimidation employed by a hard core of militants of the NUM to prevent their fellow miners reporting for work. We should not be deceived into accepting that a genuine grievance over the first, supposing that it exists, justified the second.

What constitutes an 'uneconomic' pit is not the clear-cut question that it might be if we were looking at the coal industry purely from the standpoint of a private investor interested in getting a return for his money within a relatively brief portion of his own personal life-span, and disposed to measure such a return beside those expected from

alternative forms of investment. Viewed in that context, many of the pits now booked for closure may indeed be designated as 'uneconomic'.

Nations dealing with national resources, however, are wise to look at such questions in a much wider and longer-term dimension. They must, to begin with, think in terms far beyond the needs of the present generation. They do, or should, regard resources within the home territory and under national control as worth double the value of equivalent resources that are the property of foreigners and whose products must be obtained by means of international trade. Nations are obliged to pay heed to the political and social, as well as economic, consequences of any policy decision which deprives many tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of men of their jobs. These are questions which do not occupy the private capitalist, who is concerned with profitability alone, and furthermore with profitability within a very limited time scale.

In coal, Britain is fortunate to be blessed with vast reserves of a vital energy source, for which in the long term she has no adequate alternative. This energy source will assume again ever greater importance when the present offshore oil boom has ended, and this could be especially so if declining world oil reserves lead the remaining OPEC countries to continue to jack up oil prices to unacceptable heights. Not only should we be thinking in terms of nurturing our coal reserves to cater for existing needs for that fuel and the continuation of those needs over the next century, we should also be thinking in terms of switching to coal to power numerous other industries which at present are powered by other means — the railways being one possible example. And even where we continue to require oil we should plan for the day when we obtain this source of energy by means of extraction

from coal, as did Germany with great effect during World War II.

Some of the pits now dismissed as 'uneconomic' in fact contain considerable reserves of coal, though at levels which require modernisation on a huge scale to enable it to be reached. The cost of this modernisation, involving as it does expensive improvements in mining technology, is regarded as higher, in strict profit-and-loss terms, than the cost of laying off thousands of miners with generous redundancy benefits — and so indeed it is as long as we are thinking in perspectives of 10 or 15 years ahead. It is the argument of those who oppose the closures that these perspectives are much too narrow and restricted, both with regard to time and to the full range of consequences liable to ensue from the closure programme as presently envisaged. We have to agree with this argument.

In pits where the cost of extraction has become impossibly high, and where there is no evidence of substantial reserves beyond those presently being tapped, the case for closure is of course overwhelming. Within the range of a better economic policy, which gave promise of alternative employment in the areas affected, it would be possible to plan such closures with a minimum of upheaval and distress. Given the economic policies of the present Government, on the other hand, the prospects of alternative employment for redundant miners are extremely poor. A weapon is put into the hands of the militants which they have not hesitated to use.

Thus has the Government, by its own errors of policy, largely created the climate in which Arthur Scargill and his travelling circus of red thugs are able to pose as the champions and protectors of their fellow miners' jobs. Notwithstanding this, we would expect a government with a modicum of resolution to refuse to tolerate the thuggery that has actually occurred — a thuggery which, without any doubt, brought pits to a halt which would have continued working had the majority of miners' will prevailed.

## Collapse of will

During the past weeks we have witnessed one after another pit brought to a standstill by 'flying pickets' who have so terrified the majority of mineworkers that the latter have felt forced to join the miners' strike against their better judgement. These pickets have not been stopped from doing their dirty work by laws which, in theory, permit the National Coal Board to obtain injunctions against them which they are liable to be jailed for defying. Of course these laws were introduced by the Tory Government as a pure cosmetic exercise, despite the advice of both senior policemen and lawyers that previously existing law was quite adequate to deal with such situations providing that police had the force necessary to make the required arrests and were fully backed up by

# SPEARHEAD

No. 186 APRIL 1984

Seacroft, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex

Editor: John Tyndall

*Spearhead* exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its founder and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisations *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

*Spearhead* welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.



government in any action they may take.

In fact both these requirements have been lacking in the recent confrontations. Police have been faced by violent mobs of a size with which they cannot possibly cope with the existing methods and equipment. At best they can, with difficulty, sometimes clear a path through the picket lines for miners wishing to report for work; what they have not been able to do is bring the full force of the law down on the pickets by arresting them *en masse*. For this to be possible, the Government would first have to call in the armed forces to assist the police in riot control, and then to equip the latter for arresting operations in a way which they

conclude that the Government is too soft.

Thus must the Government take the bulk of the blame for the whole miserable episode of the miners' strike and the violence that has attended it, first for short-sighted policies that have threatened far more jobs by closures than need have been threatened, second for flabbiness and weakness in dealing with intimidation at the colliery gates. In the event, Tory spokesmen have no right to condemn what has happened; what has happened is the consequence of their own Government's failure of policy and will.

## Shadow boxing

Quite predictably, Mrs. Thatcher has come back empty handed from the Brussels conference at which she sought to obtain a reduction in Britain's contribution to the EEC budget. When the previous conference on this subject in Athens ended in no concessions to Britain, we said that it was time for the Government to draw the obvious conclusions and take Britain out of the Community. The Brussels fiasco merely underlines the necessity for this — if ever that were needed.

We have no sympathy whatsoever with the tears now being shed about the intransigence of the other EEC members over this matter. As we have said before, someone who joins a club knowing the rules of that club to be unfavourable to their interests and then whines to high heaven when they fail to get those rules changed deserves no sympathy. Britain should never have joined the EEC. Having joined and then found — as this journal predicted at the time — that the Community offered nothing to us but only drained us, we should long ago have left it.

What has the Government so far done in retaliation for the failure at Brussels? Nothing more to date than a refusal to pay in advance the sum of £100 million which represents the next instalment due from this country to the EEC coffers. The sum is in fact not due to be paid in any obligatory sense until the 20th April and the Government has promised to pay it by that date. This represents the sum total of resistance on the part of the Government towards the EEC money sharks.

Even such a generally pro-Tory publication as *The Spectator* seemed to have the measure of the Government's posture on these payments to Europe when it said (24th March):—

"There is good reason for Mrs. Thatcher's uncouth determination to talk about money at these summits — that is money coming from her taxpayers. There may also be a less creditable reason. This is that it prevents her from having to talk about the larger question of Britain's membership of the EEC."

And further on:—

"... Britain's membership of the EEC is fundamentally anomalous. But what follows from that is too painful for a hard-pressed politician to contemplate. M. Mitterand has helped Mrs. Thatcher. He has given her a platform for the European elections capable of

winning both pro- and anti-European votes — I stand up to Europe, she can say to the antis. Let us see a good deal through, she can say to the pros. Difficult political arguments are therefore postponed. On Tuesday night Mrs. Thatcher seemed duly grateful."

We could not possibly put it better than *The Spectator*. The current agitation against Britain's contribution to the EEC budget is nothing but shadow boxing and a rather feeble internal political stunt, prompted by recent opinion polls which show that a majority of the British public is now against membership of the EEC. There is no honesty in the posture, nor any genuine objective bearing upon this country's true interests. There remains no true alternative to getting out of the Community — which, as *The Spectator* says, is the real issue.


## The Budget

Whenever the Chancellor of the Exchequer introduces a new budget, we receive letters from our readers indicating that they expect us to come forth with a summary of the merits or otherwise of the budget, as if in the tradition of Fleet Street journalism. When we do not say anything about the budget, some draw the inference that we are lost for words on the matter.

*Spearhead* does not feel constrained, in the manner of 'orthodox' organs of political opinion, to comment on every Chancellor's budget because we regard all budgets as almost wholly irrelevant to the needs of national economic recovery. Budgets are about how to play with the country's remaining funds — after the bankers have extracted their illegal cut from those funds. The various parties of Westminster will, as usual, go through the charade of arguing over this matter — one being in favour of concessions to one quarter and another being in favour of concessions to another quarter — but none will dare to question the chief article of faith that lies behind every budget: that it is a natural function of the economy for the government to borrow money from the banks which the latter have merely 'created' out of nothing and to go on paying interest on this money for all eternity. There can be no meaningful discussion about public expenditure, tax relief, pensions, or any other item of budgeting until this basic superstition is laid low and the sum total of money the government needs is exactly equal to the sum total of the requirement of public services, and excluding tribute paid to the bankers which has not been earned.

## Big bore

First prize for Bore of the Year must surely go to the seemingly interminable saga of the American Democratic primary election. Is this event really of so much interest to Britons that it must dominate our TV news reports night after night?



### SCARGILL'S MILITANTS

Government has played into their hands

have not yet even dared to contemplate. Clearly, it would be impossible even under such conditions to apprehend every picket involved, but a sufficient number could be arrested and charged who could then be made an example of to discourage others. Also, it should be quite sufficient to invoke existing laws of conspiracy to arrest and charge those ringleaders responsible for organising the violence — starting with Scargill himself. One section of the Public Order Act of 1936, for example, empowers the police to arrest and charge, and courts to convict, any person participating in a body which is organised, trained or equipped so as to cause reasonable apprehension that it may be used to employ physical force in the promotion of a political object. Yet neither this nor any other law has been applied against the picket mobs at our coalfields. Why not? We can only



# WAS ORWELL ONE OF US?

THE WORLDWIDE PUBLICITY being showered on George Orwell, now that his futuristic 1984 has at last arrived, presents us with a challenging question: To whom does Orwell belong? — to the socialists and leftists who first brought him into prominence as a writer? or to their opponents, the so-called conservatives?

What needs to be explained is this century's most uncharacteristic socialist, claimed as their own by those now busily reprinting his books, and by their opponents who more frequently quote from the same books. Orwell always described himself as a socialist, but we are left with the question: what did he mean by "socialist"?

The book that first brought him to public notice was *The Road to Wigan Pier*. This had been commissioned and partly paid for in advance by the publisher Victor Gollancz for the Left Book Club — both frankly pro-Communist, Gollancz having been much impressed by Orwell's eloquence and power as a socialist proselytizer.



**GEORGE ORWELL**  
Caused consternation on the left

But the manuscript, with its account of Orwell's experiences and observations in the depressed areas of Lancashire and Yorkshire, and his comments about what the socialist movement should be doing about all that squalor and injustice, plunged the Left Book Club's literary selectors into consternation. In the first part of the book Orwell said everything Gollancz and his comrades wanted said, brilliantly, as only Orwell could have said it — but in the second part he scornfully dissociated himself from virtually all those who called themselves socialists, thus: "One sometimes gets the impression that the words 'Socialism' and 'Communism' draw towards them with magnetic force every fruit-juice drinker, nudist, sandal-wearer, sex maniac, Quaker, 'nature-cure' quack, pacifist and feminist in England."

Elsewhere he writes of, "that dreary tribe of high-minded women and sandal-wearers and bearded fruit-juice drinkers who come

## **IVOR BENSON looks at the life and thoughts of the prophet of 1984**

flocking towards the smell of 'progress' like bluebottles to a dead cat."

With these words, Orwell has by no means exhausted his vocabulary of invective, and it would have been hard to find anyone calling himself a socialist who was spared. Of the people he had encountered at a meeting of the Independent Labour Party, he had asked himself: "Are these mingy little beasts the champions of the working class?"

The worker type who eventually became a Labour Party MP he describes as "the most desolating spectacle the world contains," the man who, having been picked to fight for his mates, uses the opportunity only to "better" himself and join the class he is supposed to be fighting.

### **MOMENT OF TRUTH**

Socialism's intellectual *élite* fare no better. Bernard Shaw, Henry Barbusse, Upton Sinclair, William Morris and Waldo Frank, Orwell condemns impartially as "dull, empty windbags", the much-publicised socialist poet W. H. Auden as "a gutless Kipling", and Beatrice Webb, one of socialism's great theorists, as "a mealy-mouthed slum visitor". Of these and other advocates of revolutionary change he writes: "The truth is that to many people, calling themselves socialists, revolution does not mean a movement of the masses with which they hope to associate themselves; it means a set of reforms which 'we', the clever ones, are going to impose on 'them', the Lower Orders."

Such remarks would have left very few of the subscribers to the Left Book Club unscathed and, characteristically, Orwell would not allow one line of it to be altered or omitted.

So, what were Gollancz and his comrades to do with Orwell's book *The Road to Wigan Pier*? If they rejected it, someone else would be sure to publish it. Gollancz decided to publish, but with a foreword which he himself wrote and in which he tries to lessen the sting of the offending passages.

The process of disillusionment had begun almost from the moment Orwell was taken up by the socialist movement, and was complete by the time he returned from the Spanish Civil War, where he had gone to risk

his life to defend "freedom" and "justice".

He had made a discovery of enormous importance, both to himself and the world: that socialist ideology which he had tried so hard to promote as the vehicle of his own social idealism, was also being used by a power-hungry *élite* for the purpose of replacing one system of injustice with another, their own — a monstrous confidence trick which had already been perpetrated with great success in the Soviet Union.

That was not the message which the British masters of the socialist movement wanted to hear or have bruited about. Orwell's book about his experiences in Spain, *Homage to Barcelona*, a biting criticism of Communism and of the Soviet Union as one of its creations, was rejected out of hand by Gollancz, and was so viciously panned by the critics when it did appear that very few copies were sold.

But Orwell's creative genius was not to be stymied. He wrote a little book, little more than an essay in length, *Animal Farm*, which, like Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, can be read either as a charming piece of fiction which even little children can read with pleasure, or as a scathing political allegory.

The bosses of the socialist movement were not deceived; they knew at a glance that the "farm" was Russia and the "animals" the people of that country; and they recognised as themselves those cunning "pigs" who had led the revolt of the animals against Mr. Jones the farmer, only to betray them later.

After having been rejected by twelve publishers in Britain and the United States as likely to be offensive to the Soviet Union — by that time the West's "noble ally" against Nazi Germany — *Animal Farm* was finally published and "took off" without the need for any promotion, as only a work of pure genius can.

And those who hated it dared not attack it or try to suppress it for fear of drawing still more attention to it.

Clearly, then, Orwell and those who had tried to use him as a hot-gospeller for socialism were attaching radically different meanings to the word "socialism"; and he would have had to qualify the word, or invent a new one, in order to separate the two meanings.

### **'WORLD OF LIES'**

We only have to read what Orwell wrote to find out for ourselves what he means with the word "socialism" — he means what can be described, with less risk of being misunderstood, as "ethical socialism", an imagined system in which social ethics, or moral principles, are the determining factor. The "socialism" which Gollancz and his comrades

*Contd. on next page*

*Reproduced with acknowledgements to  
BEHIND THE NEWS, P.O. Box 1564,  
Krugersdorp 1740, South Africa.*



of the Left Book Club were touting, and which the socialist movement today is cunningly insinuating into public affairs, is something quite different: **a programme for the concentration of economic and political power** which deceitfully promises to give people the justice they yearn for.

The one asks us to **think seriously about social values** in order to acquire the knowledge and vigilance with which to promote and protect them; while the other urges us to **align ourselves with a power-oriented movement** which promises to give us everything we want, thus absolving us from any need to think. Again, ethical socialism (to give it a name) is a social ideal in which **you**, the individual, believe, of which **you** are the custodian, and for which **you** hold yourself **personally responsible**; the other socialism is a **movement in which you believe**, a movement to which **you delegate responsibility**, a movement which could be under the control of aliens who, by verbalising your ideal, hold **you** in bondage.

As was only to be expected, it was not the workers but mainly the rootless intellectuals, the misfits, cranks and self-seekers, all kinds of people looking for some "cause" to give meaning to their shallow lives, who came pouring in to follow the socialist banner. Orwell did not realise when he exclaimed against those rootless intellectuals who, as he saw it, give the socialist movement a "bad name", that these were precisely the kind of people the socialist movement wanted, people who could be used with great effect if planted in sufficient numbers in the schools and universities, in the bureaucracies, in the media and in politics — as has happened all over the Western world.

Paul Gray, writing in *Time* magazine of November 28th, 1983, remarked that the imminence of the Orwellian Year had "galvanised a small army of professors, critics and writers, journalists, pundits, social scientists, politicians and professional doomsters", and that hardly had any one paid for thinking out aloud seemed to have been able to resist the temptation to play with Orwell's numbers.

## MEANING OF '1984'

There is no need to speculate endlessly about "Orwell's numbers" because the meaning of *Nineteen Eighty-four* is clear enough, if only to those who need and can use its message. Written as fiction, the book is basically no more or less than a manual of information and guidance for any individual with a will to resist the soul-killing influences of enforced conformity. It is a venture into the interior of the psyche and an exploration of the innumerable cunning means that are used to persuade, coerce or trick the individual into submission.

Orwell was not offering a glimpse into the future, but only an insight into what was actually happening, and continues to happen, as a socialist totalitarianism surreptitiously expands its dominion over mankind. He helps

us to grasp significant meanings by isolating them, explaining them and **giving them names**.

What Orwell calls *Newspeak* we have had with us for a long time, but we recognise it more easily, some even for the first time, after it has been explained and **given a name**.

When the great Russian empire was grabbed by an oligarchy of huge financial power in 1917, *Newspeak* was used to describe the new regime as "the dictatorship of the proletariat," and enough *Newspeak* words and phrases have been invented and put into circulation since then to fill a big dictionary — thus, anyone who speaks up for his own nation is a "fascist" or "nazi", and anyone who shows a preference for people of his own kind is a "racist". As Orwell explains, war conducted by the totalitarians is "peace", ignorance is "knowledge", and so on.

Unlearning all the *Newspeak* which has accumulated in the last thirty years is, therefore, a major exercise to be undertaken by the individual who seeks to re-establish the sovereignty of his own soul.

If we are to avoid being the victims of *Newspeak* and *Doublethink* practised on us by others, and avoid falling into the error of using it in the conduct of our own affairs, we shall find ourselves better equipped after a guided tour through the morally insanitary underworld where it belongs. We must harden ourselves against squeamishness as, with Orwell to guide us, we discover that it means to "know and not know", to be "conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies", to "hold contradictory opinions and believe them both", to "use logic against logic", etc., the effect of all these devices being to feed poison into the nerve ends of sanity.

Happenings of the greatest imaginable importance are hardly noticed, or if noticed not understood, simply because we do not have the language, the words or phrases, which capture and retain their meaning long enough to enable us to think intelligently about them.

"Who controls the past controls the future; who controls the present controls the past" — so runs the slogan of the *Inasoc* party in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-four*. Most of us are totally incapable of grasping anything so abstract unless we can be given some examples; but once we grasp the meaning and keep it linked in our minds to the slogans we can then go on and find innumerable other examples for ourselves.

## 'CONFUSION IS A WEAPON'

With Orwell as their tutor, many will understand for the first time the vicious campaigns of denigration and invalidation conducted against those who have dared to draw attention to some fairly obvious falsehoods in the history of our century, and especially of the period during and after the end of World War II.

Writes Dr. Antony Sutton, one-time

Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution of War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University, California: "Twentieth century history recorded in Establishment textbooks and journals is inaccurate . . . the prevailing Establishment version is seen to be not only inaccurate but designed to hide a pervasive fabric of deceit and immoral conduct" (*Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*).

Those who control the past also control the future — that is why those who now control the present, or aspire to do so, are thrown in paroxysms of fear and rage when their control of the past is challenged, as it has been challenged in recent years over the endlessly repeated assertion that in World War II the Germans were guilty of the gas-chamber murder of six million Jews. On this issue of genuine historical interest requests for scholarly investigation and discussion are just as angrily rejected as outright denials that such a "holocaust" ever took place.

Those who control the present have also been highly successful in "controlling the past" in regard to events in Russia before, during and after the Bolshevik Revolution, in the Middle East, and in many other parts of the world.

Orwell calls this mutability of the past "a vast system of mental cheating".

A man who speaks and writes like that can hardly be said to be on the side of socialist totalitarianism — even if known to have once been in love with socialism as the imagined repository of his social idealism.

## EXPOSED PSYCHOLOGICAL WEAPONS

No one has been more successful than George Orwell in explaining and laying bare the weapons of sophisticated psychological warfare being used against the people of the West, weapons which only need to be identified, understood and **given a name** to be rendered obsolete. One of these which can be defined is the application to human beings of conditioned reflex techniques which have always been used with great success in the training of animals; however, even people who know all about conditioned reflexes and may even have read about Pavlov's experiments with dogs, have failed to notice how their own minds are being manipulated in exactly the same way.

Orwell explains: "The first and simplest stage in the discipline, which can be taught even to young children, is called *crimestop*. *Crimestop* means the faculty of stopping short as though by instinct at the threshold of any dangerous thought. It includes the power of not grasping analogies, of failing to perceive logical errors, of misunderstanding the simplest arguments if they are inimical to *Ingsoc* (those in power), and of being bored or repelled by any train of thought which is capable of leading in a heretical direction. *Crimestop*, in short, means protective stupidity."

*Crimestop* operates in many different



## WAS ORWELL ONE OF US?

(Contd. from prev. page)

ways. It makes people react with feelings of revulsion or fear to certain trigger words like "racist", "fascist", "extremist", "apartheid", etc.; and not only afraid to discuss the Jewish role in the Middle East and the Soviet Union but even to hear it mentioned by someone else.

Nowhere in *Nineteen Eighty-four* is Orwell's tender concern for threatened values more clearly expressed than in these lines in which he discusses a totalitarian state's demands for the undivided loyalty of its population:

"The thing that now suddenly struck Winston was that his mother's death, nearly thirty years ago, had been tragic and sorrowful in a way that was no longer possible. Tragedy, he perceived, belonged to the ancient time, to a time when there was still privacy, love and friendship, and when the members of a family stood by one another without needing to know the reason. His mother's memory tore at his heart because she had died loving him, when he was too young and selfish to love her in return, and because, somehow, he did not remember how, she had sacrificed herself to a conception of loyalty that was private and unalterable."

It would not have been necessary to explain to Orwell what Shakespeare meant with the advice which Pollonius gives to his son Laertes: "Those friends thou hast, and their adoption tried, grapple them to thy soul with hoops of steel." Without private loyalties we are starved of all the fruits of loyalty; and woe betide the one who fixes his loyalty instead on the state, the party or the company that employs him.

As for the slogan "all animals are equal but some are more equal than others", of which we read in *Animal Farm*, this is nowhere better exemplified than in the Soviet Union with its scores of thousands of millionaire "pigs" who own and operate innumerable industrial and commercial enterprises inside a state which condemns private ownership and enterprise as a major crime.

Many people today, as they look around, reflect with a feeling of relief that Orwell's predictions for 1984 did not turn out to be correct. "Behind the Iron Curtain, maybe," so they say, "but — thank heaven! — not here!" Even the Swedes, whose society is the most Orwellian this side of the Iron Curtain, are now reading translations of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-four*, sombrely congratulating themselves, as they look around, on the absence of "thought police", torture chambers and slave labour camps of the kind described.

In fact, Sweden today is an even more chilling prototype of socialist totalitarianism than the Soviet Union, precisely because it has nothing remotely resembling the KGB, no torture chambers and no slave camps — for there the great majority of the people

have been so thoroughly conquered in their minds that these appurtenances of violence are not needed. The Russians should rejoice rather that they still have with them all the horrible things described by Solzhenitsyn in his *Gulag Archipelago* volumes, as proof that they continue to resist and in heart and soul remain unconquered.

That explains why in the Soviet Union, where the totalitarian evil can be plainly seen and understood, there has remained enough of the freedom of the spirit, a freedom capable of being exercised even in a slave camp and under torture, to produce some of the twentieth century's finest literature. That is no exaggeration, for was it not an inviolable freedom of the spirit, beyond the reach of Solzhenitsyn's slave camp guards, which made it possible for him to gather up and later retrieve the vivid imagery which he later put into *A Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovitch*? We can only imagine what that book is like in the original Russian.

### 'THE CONTROVERSY OF ZION'

In this short article on a vast subject, it remains only to discuss briefly Orwell's attitude towards another of the major influences at work in shaping the history of the 20th century: namely, Zionism.

Orwell never wrote about Zionism, but his literary contemporaries have left us in no doubt that he was decidedly against it. Writes one of his biographers, T. R. Fyvel, himself a fervent Zionist: "I knew that Orwell completely disagreed with me; to him the Palestine Arabs were coloured Asians, the Palestine Jews the equivalent of the white rulers of India and Burma, an oversimplification from which he was not to be budged..." (*George Orwell: a Personal Memoir*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1982).

Like all those who declare themselves against Zionism, Orwell was accused of being also anti-Semitic. Fyvel writes: "Our differences over Jewish issues went beyond Palestine and Israel. In a letter Orwell wrote to Julian Symons from Jura, he said: 'I have no doubt that Fyvel thinks that I am anti-semitic'. Well, no. I never would have said that. Orwell's friend, Malcolm Muggeridge, however, did. In his reflections on Orwell's funeral service he wrote: 'Interesting, I thought, that George should have so attracted Jews, because he was at heart strongly anti-Semitic'."

The fact that nearly all Orwell's early supporters were Jews is hardly surprising, since the socialist movement in Britain was largely a Jewish exercise led by the likes of Victor Gollancz and Harold Laski who quickly recognised Orwell's usefulness as a proselytizer of socialist idealism.

But was Orwell anti-Semitic? Fyvel reveals more than he himself knew when he discusses a somewhat heated argument he had with Orwell over an article entitled *Revenge is Sour* in the *Tribune* of November 9th, 1945: "In this he described how shortly

after the fighting ended he was shown round a prisoner-of-war camp in south Germany by a young Viennese Jewish officer in a U.S. captain's uniform whom he tried hard to like but clearly did not. He related how he watched this Jewish officer shout at, and kick, a captured SS officer who, one-time torturer though he probably had been, now looked to Orwell only a pitiful being in need of psychological treatment."

What upset Fyvel was this passage in Orwell's article: "It is absurd to blame any German or Austrian Jew for getting his own back on the Nazis."

Fyvel continues: "That was all he wrote of the background, which I thought quite out of proportion. I said to Orwell that here in Hitler's so-called 'Final solution of the Jewish Question' one had the greatest deliberate crime committed in man's history, yet all Orwell did was to mention it in one brief and dismissive sentence in a lengthy article telling how one Jewish officer kicked one SS man, an action Orwell referred to as 'getting his own back'. That was surely standing history on its head. How conceivably could the relatives of the six million murdered Jews 'get their own back' on the Nazis? Moreover, what was Orwell's point in referring to this particular man throughout the article simply as 'the Jew' — 'the Jew' did this, 'the Jew' did that, or worse, 'the little Jew' did the other?..."

Fyvel admits that his remonstrance had no effect whatever on Orwell's views. Indeed, instead of sharing Fyvel's indignation about German "war crimes", Orwell had, in the same *Tribune* article, called on the British Government to protest against the Soviet expulsion of Germans from East Prussia as a crime against humanity! There is only one conclusion to be drawn from what Fyvel tells us: **Orwell did not believe the story of the gas-chamber killing of six million Jews.**

Moreover, Orwell's reference to the officer "he tried hard to like but did not" suggests that he was not favourably impressed by the innumerable young Jews in American army uniforms, many of them far more fluent in German than English, who swarmed all over Germany almost from the moment the shooting stopped.

Orwell's opposition to Zionism thus completes the picture of this century's most uncharacteristic socialist, who emerges finally as this century's most potent antidote to the poisonous and addictive socialist ideology that he once professed.

The nagging question remains: Why the present acceptance of Orwell by an establishment that is everywhere committed to socialist centralisation of power?

Short answer: George Orwell's genius cannot be ignored; Orwell is bigger than Big Brother; his utterances are proverbial and irrepressible, and are more easily misinterpreted and vulgarised than repudiated — as Paul Gray remarks of all the present 1984 ballyhoo: "Can Doublethink T shirts and Big Brother barbecue aprons be far behind?"



# Macaulay Reads America's Palm

Lord Macaulay, to our mind, represents the apex of British historical genius. He spoke like a Cicero, wrote like a Gibbon, had the perspicacity of a Henry Adams and was no ivory tower weaver of abstractions, but learned his political science in the practical workshop of the British Parliament. The following are excerpts from some letters he wrote before the Civil War to an American biographer of Jefferson, Henry S. Randall, who had been importuning Macaulay with adulatory comments about democracy and democracy's champion, the sage of Monticello. Macaulay courteously refused to buy the arguments and in his inimitable, lofty, sonorous diction, which Churchill later plagiarized to the point of banality, hung some black crepe on the rosy clouds of the American future.


I am certain that I never wrote a line, and that I never, in Parliament, in conversation, or even on the hustings,—a place where it is the fashion to court the populace,—uttered a word indicating an opinion that the supreme authority in a state ought to be intrusted to the majority of citizens told by the head, in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society. I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty, or civilisation, or both. In Europe, where the population is dense, the effect of such institutions would be almost instantaneous. What happened lately in France is an example. In 1848 a pure democracy was established there. During a short time there was reason to expect a general spoliation, a national bankruptcy, a new partition of the soil, a maximum of prices, a ruinous load of taxation laid on the rich for the purpose of supporting the poor in idleness. Such a system would, in twenty years, have made France as poor and barbarous as the France of the Carolingians. Happily the danger was averted; and now there is a despotism, a silent tribune, an enslaved press. Liberty is gone, but civilisation has been saved. I have not the smallest doubt that, if we had a purely democratic government here, the effect would be the same. Either the poor would plunder the rich, and civilisation would perish, or order and property would be saved by a strong military government, and liberty would perish. You may think that your country enjoys an exemption from these evils. I will frankly own to you that I am of a very different opinion. Your fate I believe to be certain, though it is deferred by a physical cause. As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your labouring population will be far more at ease than the labouring population of the old world; and, while that is the case, the Jeffersonian polity may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity. But the time will come when New England will be as thickly peopled as old England. Wages will be as low, and will fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Birminghams, and in those Manchesters and Birminghams, hundreds of thousands of artisans will assuredly be sometimes out of work. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. Distress

everywhere makes the labourer mutinous and discontented, and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million while another cannot get a full meal. In bad years there is plenty of grumbling here, and sometimes a little rioting. But it matters little. For here the sufferers are not the rulers. The supreme power is in the hands of a class, numerous indeed, but select; of an educated class, of a class which is, and knows itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the maintenance of order. Accordingly, the malcontents are firmly, yet gently, restrained. The bad time is got over without robbing the wealthy to relieve the indigent. The springs of national prosperity soon begin to flow again: work is plentiful: wages rise; and all is tranquility and cheerfulness. I have seen England pass three or four times through such critical seasons as I have described. Through such seasons the United States will have to pass, in the course of the next century, if not of this. How will you pass through them? I heartily wish you a good deliverance. But my reason and my wishes are at war; and I cannot help foreboding the worst . . . The day will come when, in the State of New York, a multitude of people, none of whom has had more than half a breakfast, or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose a Legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of a Legislature will be chosen? On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, strict observance of public faith. On the other is a demagogue ranting about the tyranny of capitalists and usurers, and asking why anybody should be permitted to drink Champagne and to ride in a carriage, while thousands of honest folks are in want of necessities. Which of the two candidates is likely to be preferred by a working man who hears his children cry for more bread? I seriously apprehend that you will, in some such season of adversity as I have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act like people who should in a year of scarcity, devour all of the seed corn, and thus make the next year a year, not of scarcity, but of absolute famine. There will be, I fear, spoliation. The spoliation will increase the distress. The distress will produce fresh spoliation. There is nothing to stop you. Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. As I said before, when a society has entered on this downward progress, either civilisation or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand; or your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth;—with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions.

Thinking thus, of course, I cannot reckon Jefferson among the benefactors of mankind. I readily admit that his intentions were good and his abilities considerable. Odious stories have been circulated about his private life; but I do not know on what evidence those stories



rest, and I think it probable that they are false, or monstrously exaggerated . . . If you can derive any comfort as to the future destinies of your country from your conviction that a benevolent Creator will never suffer more human beings to be born than can live in plenty, it is a comfort of which I should be sorry to deprive you. By the same process of reasoning one may arrive at many very agreeable conclusions, such as that there is no cholera, no malaria, no yellow fever, no negro slavery, in the world. Unfortunately for me, perhaps, I learned from Lord Bacon a method of investigating the truth diametrically opposite to that which you appear to follow. I am perfectly aware of the immense progress which your country has made and is making in population and wealth. I know that the labourer with you has large wages, at ancient food, and the means of giving some education to his children. But I see no reason for attributing these things to the policy of Jefferson. I see no reason to believe that your progress would have been less rapid, that your labouring people would have been worse fed or clothed or taught, if your government had been conducted on the principles of Washington and Hamilton. Nay, you will, I am sure, acknowledge that the progress which you are now making is only a continuation of the progress which you have been making ever since the middle of the seventeenth century, and that the blessings which you now enjoy were enjoyed by your forefathers who were loyal subjects of the kings of England. The contrast between the labourer of New York and the labourer of Europe is not stronger now than it was when New York was governed by noblemen and gentlemen commissioned under the English great seal. And there are at this moment dependencies of the English crown in which all the phenomena which you attribute to purely democratic institutions may be seen in the highest perfection. The colony of Victoria, in Australasia, was planted only twenty years ago. The population is now, I suppose, near a million. The revenue is enormous, near five millions sterling, and raised without any murmuring. The wages of labour are higher than they are even with you. Immense sums are expended on education. And this in a province governed by the delegate of a hereditary sovereign. It therefore seems to me quite clear that the facts which you cite to prove the excellence of purely democratic institutions ought to be ascribed not to those institutions, but to causes which operated in America long before your Declaration of Independence, and which are still operating in many parts of the British Empire. You will perceive, therefore, that I do not propose, as you thought, to sacrifice the interests of the present generation to those of remote generations. It would, indeed, be absurd in a nation to part with institutions to which it is indebted for immense present prosperity from an apprehension that,



LORD MACAULAY

after the lapse of a century, those institutions may be found to produce mischief. But I do not admit that the prosperity which your country enjoys arises from those parts of your polity which may be called, in an especial manner,

Jeffersonian. Those parts of your polity already produce bad effects, and will, unless I am greatly mistaken, produce fatal effects if they shall last till North America has two hundred inhabitants to the square mile.

*Reproduced with acknowledgements to  
INSTAURATION, Box 76, Cape Canaveral,  
Florida 32920, U.S.A.*



SHOULD NATIONALISTS support proportional representation? My postbag quite frequently contains letters which raise this question, and the question is not uncommon during the discussion periods that follow the main speeches at party meetings. Obviously there is a feeling among some that the PR system may provide the key to a better political future in Britain, and it is therefore perhaps the time to put the issue under the microscope.

# PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION: A POLITICAL RED HERRING

Mere changes in the voting system will not meet the requirements of British recovery, says JOHN TYNDALL

The strongest argument advanced by the champions of PR is that it is a fairer, more just system than the present British one in that it distributes political power more accurately in accordance with the wishes of the electorate — which, after all, its advocates say, is surely what democracy is all about. It is difficult to disagree with such a claim when we recall the results of the 1983 General Election which gave the Liberal/SDP Alliance a total of votes not very far short of those won by the Labour Party but left the Alliance with only a tiny fraction of the number of Labour's seats. This state of affairs was reached owing to the fact that the Alliance came second in the poll in a very large number of areas but first in very few; in many Tory strongholds it did much better than Labour and in many Labour strongholds much better than the Tories. Certainly the protests by Alliance spokesmen afterwards that the results underline the ludicrous injustice of the system have very good foundation.

Proportional representation is also supported on the grounds that it offers a fairer chance to small parties struggling at the bottom rung of the political ladder. Such parties could, by obtaining a certain percentage of the national vote (5 percent is a figure that has been talked about), win a limited

number of seats in Parliament, even if they had no hope of outscoring their rivals in any one area. Small parties might, additionally, be helped by the rule of the transferable vote, which usually forms a part of the PR system. By such a rule each elector can have a first and a second choice in votes, and experience in countries where the rule operates indicates that one of these votes is often used to support a party which the elector knows cannot win but which most closely represents

Parliament, it would bring them somewhat nearer that objective than they are at the moment. This, however, is no reason for Nationalists to support PR, as some would have us do. We are in business to fight, on principle, for political changes that would benefit the nation, and the PR issue must be judged in that light alone. The pressure for PR during our time would anyway not be the slightest bit strengthened by any support we gave to it, probably the contrary.

The chief thrust of the opposition to proportional representation comes, as might be expected, from the parties who stand most to lose by its introduction, and in the form of the argument that it would reduce British politics to a condition of constant instability, with no one party able to obtain a governing majority and the resulting need for coalitions which may regularly be short-lived. The chaotic condition of Italian politics is often cited as an example of this tendency, with governments coming and going in bewildering succession. Pre-Gaullist France could be cited as a similar phenomenon.

## Stability

That those who put forward this argument have an obvious vested interest in doing so should not be allowed to obscure the merits of the argument itself. Stable government is certainly something that every nation wants, provided that it is a stability under which things are proceeding in the right direction and not the stability of a slow national death. Can it be said, though, that the instability of the present Italian system is any the worse a condition than the instability of the present British one, which, although perhaps in some ways different in origin and kind, is similar in its harmful

*Contd. overleaf*



## PALACE OF HUMBAG

PR system will not secure election of better political leaders or provide the mechanism for sound government. The same racket will rule.



## PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

(Contd. from prev. page)

national effects? The basic weaknesses are still there, whatever system prevails. The body politic is hopelessly and viciously divided, with no possibility existing for a combined national effort towards recovery. Every party's advantage must be pursued to the detriment of its rivals, which means that to every party except that in power there is no benefit in national success or prosperity but, on the contrary, every benefit in a situation in which the nation flounders. The majority of parties are in business to hinder the work of government rather than assist it, and to denigrate every act of government as a necessary part of the political party game, rather than view government action objectively and on the basis of merit. Loyalty to nation must inevitably become of lesser priority than loyalty to party. The rat-fight to determine which party is on top always takes precedence over the battle to cope with national problems and to defeat the nation's internal and external enemies.

No incoming government, under whichever variety of the 'liberal-democratic' system, can afford to take decisions necessary to long-term national welfare and development where those decisions might, in the shorter run, jeopardise the popularity of the party in power.

And that popularity, instead of being based, as is the democratic ideal, on an informed and intelligent appreciation by the people of the great national issues, is never other than dependent on rapid and fickle changes of fancy, fuelled mainly by a news media over which 99.99 percent of 'the people' have no power or influence whatsoever but is controlled by unelected mandarins of the 'establishment' or otherwise by big business sharks whose sole loyalty is to the god of profit.

## Corruption

Government, under whatever system, is one huge game of bribery and corruption, in which votes are extracted from the people by promises that are seldom kept and by appeals to the basest self-interest which completely scorns any higher concept of the national good or any responsible duty to posterity. Politics are fought out by a series of small tricks and at a level of argument and debate which at times would shame a kindergarten. Crooks, gangsters, spivs, simpletons and buffoons who in any sane regime would be cast onto the fringes of society find their

way into positions of the highest power and quite literally hold the fate of millions in their hands. The ability to lie convincingly on a platform or before a television camera far precedes in importance the capacity to take decisions and to implement action that will overcome national problems.

And if anyone should doubt what has been said here about the standards and tone of discussion whereby these problems are deliberated over, let them just switch on for five minutes to the morning radio programme *'Yesterday in Parliament'*. What they will hear there will not be mature statesmen and leaders presenting both sides of a serious argument but noises more appropriate to a zoo at feeding or mating time.

The introduction of a system of proportional representation would not in the slightest alter the rules of this squalid and juvenile political charade; it would only bring about some changes in the party labels attached to those taking part in it.

Neither would such a system alter fundamentally the stranglehold on politics exercised by the vast and powerful extra-parliamentary institutions and pressure groups which buy, intimidate and sometimes spawn themselves the men and women who occupy the benches in the House of Commons vainly trying to maintain the pretence that they are there by the 'people's will'. I have mentioned the mass media as one of these — a leviathan which not only can make or break political leaders by building up or demolishing their reputations but can also with ease inflate or obscure the issues of the day and thus entirely contrive the climate in which elections are fought and the fate of governments decided. Add to this power the immense pull exercised by international big business, with its complete absence of commitment to any patriotic interest; by the City, whose conscience is guided pre-eminently by the latest trends on the stock market; the Trade Unions, which today have become a political mafia to whom the working classes are of interest only as a means of extracting the dues which maintain the mafia bosses in their plush offices, their Jaguars and their free holidays at luxury resorts around the world; finally, but not, least, the highly organised pressure groups which lobby for the interest of communities of racial minorities, by far the most organised and powerful of which is a community which will need no introduction to our readers.

## Checks

Within a healthy body politic, such interests are kept in check and never at any point allowed to prevail in determining

national policy. Within the racket that masquerades under the name of 'democracy', however, they become the dominant force in national affairs — with political parties and their representatives no more than compliant tools ready to serve their bidding. What appear to the innocent and uninformed as the battles of ideas fought out between the democratically elected representatives of the 'common man' are in fact no more than a symptom of the ruthless struggle for advantage between these groups of interests. In that struggle sometimes one gets the upper hand, sometimes another, but whatever the state of play at any one time — of one thing we can be sure: any politician, lobby, caucus, faction or party which causes displeasure to the number-one racial minority community will not survive for one week. This is tacitly known and understood by all, and the need to wave the big stick to emphasise it occurs only rarely.

These are the basic rules of British politics in the 20th Century, and by comparison with them the question of whether we employ a first-past-the-post system for election to Parliament or a system of proportional representation as applies throughout most of the European Continent is a question of only the most academic importance. The real requirements of good government in Britain will be as far from realisation as ever.

## Needs of Good Government

What then are these requirements? Let us end this analysis by stating them in broad outline.

The first requirement is that we breed and recruit for participation in political life an entirely new and higher calibre of public servant, moved primarily by a sense of patriotism and dedication to the welfare of the British nation and race.

Next, we must create a mechanism for choosing people for high office by which that patriotic commitment, plus real governing ability, are the crucial criteria of success, and whereby a continuing good record in these regards is the vital qualification for a lasting mandate once chosen.

This means that the entire climate in which the merits of political leaders are assessed must be one of an altogether more intelligent and informed level than exists at the present time. It must be a climate purged of lies and one in which the force of propaganda, although it may still count for something, could not possibly prevail without genuine merit on the part of that being propagated — just as, at a certain level of understanding in business life, persuasive advertising could not succeed were it not

Contd. on next page



harnessed to a quality product.

For such a climate to exist, the power to shape public opinion would have to be taken out of the hands of institutions which owe their influence essentially to **money** and which represent only **sectional interests** whose gain is the loss of other vital parts of the national community.

Equally, no racial minority groups should be permitted to be organised into forces for the exercise of political influence and power where that influence and power could come into conflict with the interests of the British nation.

Government, once chosen, must be constituted in such a way that it is given the power of action and decision necessary to tackle vital national works, to sweep away useless and debilitating national institutions, interest groups and practices, to attend to the full requirements of national defence and security (which includes internal security), to undertake development programmes based on assessments of national needs as far as a century ahead, and to give the whole of its attention to vital national questions without having to have one hand employed behind its back in defence against the batterings and intrigues of party warfare.

This is not to say that such a government should be exempt from criticism or, in the ultimate event, liable to dismissal. What is needed, however, is that such criticism comes from people and from bodies qualified to give it and whose interest lies in helping government, not destroying it, and that in the event of government losing confidence to the point of needing replacement, decisions determining such matters are made in a sober climate in which the issues are understood, not one engendered by the cheap gimmickry and ballyhoo by which elections are conducted today.

Much has been spoken in defence of the 'pluralism' that is regarded as essential to the maintenance of a democratic order of things. But what is the nature of the pluralism of which we are speaking? Does it mean a tolerance of differing opinions within a broad consensus of patriotism and commitment to vital national interests? Or does it mean the acceptance within the body politic of separate and warring factions whose interests are fundamentally incompatible with each other and often incompatible with that of the nation itself?

If it means the first, then pluralism has a place in politics which is probably essential if those politics are not to become inbred and to stagnate. But if it means the second, then it is difficult to see how under such circumstances strong and wise government can ever be possible. Ultimately, every act and policy of government has to be subject

to a highest law, which must be the good of the nation. For government and political life to be conducted in accordance with that principle, no other 'highest law' must be allowed to exist — which means, put in the bluntest terms, that no other interest must be allowed to exist. This means that not only government but every other institution within the nation — the mass media, education, the machinery for industrial relations, industry and commerce, the armed forces, cultural life and religious life — must be placed at the service of the national community and in the service of the national idea. Such freedoms as these institutions enjoy cannot be absolute but must be circumscribed by the requirements of patriotic duty.

### Common goal

Proceeding from this, the debate over national issues which takes place in the political and all other arenas must be a debate which assumes from the start the existence of a common goal, a national goal, and is about ways and means of reaching this goal; it cannot be a debate between two fundamentally opposite and conflicting goals two fundamentally opposite and conflicting interests. We see this in microcosm in Northern Ireland in the conflict between the Loyalist and Republican factions. No argument or persuasion can ever resolve the essential division between those two factions; the triumph of one has to mean the extinction of the other. On the wider panorama of British politics, the same may be said of the conflicting ideals of Nationalism and Internationalism, race preservation or racial surrender, national independence or 'one world', national defence or pacifism, cultural integrity or cultural mongrelisation and the descent to the cultural jungle. Between these philosophies and goals there can be no 'debate', and to suppose that a body politic can accommodate them simultaneously, leaving to the interplay of 'democratic' forces the task of working out choices or compromises betwixt them is to succumb to the kind of mental paralysis that is the hallmark of the progressive 'liberal' everywhere who has presided over the eclipse of Western civilisation.


No proper British recovery can be possible until the first named of the aforementioned alternatives are elevated far beyond their positions as mere 'points of view', and made into essential foundation stones of national existence, any threat to which is no more 'tolerated' than we would tolerate terrorism, rape, fraud or armed robbery.

If we return for a moment to the question of the 'fairness' and 'justice' of

political systems, it may be accepted that the PR system is 'fairer' and more 'just' than the present British system in the representation it gives to parties, but in terms of fairness and justice to the electorate — who still vote under basically the same conditions — the difference in the two systems is purely marginal.

But the main point on which we must take issue is the question of whether 'fairness' or 'justice' to the respective players of the game of party politics should in any way come into the reckoning when we are considering the efficacy of methods of government. I proceed in this debate from the premise that no form of government is a substitute for **good government**; it should be **good government**, in the last analysis, that should be our first objective, and indeed it might be claimed that the greatest fairness or justice to the people of a country is best promoted by that government which bestows on them the greatest benefits in those things that are most important to the people: good houses, ample opportunities for employment at decent wages, good care for the elderly and the very young, a good environment and a safe and secure country to live in. To the average man such things are far more important than any theoretical 'rights' he may have in the way of parties to vote for or the apportionment of 'power' among the parties once he has voted for them. There is absolutely no reason to believe that such benefits will be better secured by a PR system than by the existing system, given the basic rules under which the game is played and given the places where true power resides once the razzamataz of elections is over and real politics resume their course.

We should not be concerned with the trivia of this debate, but should be pre-occupied with the quest for an enduring political system which will meet the requirements of national recovery that I have outlined and to which the question of proportional representation is almost wholly irrelevant. I have spoken of 'requirements' and have deliberately refrained from offering any blueprints as to how those requirements are to be met. The object of this article has been to establish what the political debate is all about, not to make its concluding speech — that belongs to another and later study.



## National Review

The League Review, a pro-National Socialist political journal published in Great Britain by the League of St. George.

**£5 for 6 issues, British Isles and overseas surface mail (US \$12)**

9/11 KENSINGTON HIGH ST.  
LONDON, W8 5NP



# The bell tolls for Africa

The black man has not won 'freedom' through decolonisation but has merely exchanged one master for another, says NOEL A. HUNT

**THE CHORUS** of acclaim for the 'freedom fighters' who have 'liberated the down-trodden masses in Zimbabwe' is so strident that the black man — and many other observers of the African scene — may miss the first notes of the bell tolling the knell of black Africa as a political force.

Not that black Africa was ever a force in any real sense, of course. There was universal agreement that the ramshackle and poverty-stricken 'states' of Africa were to be taken as seriously as, say, France or Germany. The incredible stupidities, horrific threats and frequent revelations of complete incompetence and utter impotence were, and are, either ignored or glossed over.

The reason for the ostensibly black, though actually white-directed assault on the African bastions of the West is probably to be found in Lenin's dictum that the main obstacle to Communist conquest of the world was the Anglo-Saxon race. Logically, therefore, this race had first to be driven back to Europe, confined there and then destroyed.

## VICTIMS OF AFRICAN SAVAGERY

Butchered in the cause of 'liberation'



Lenin set out this view as long ago as 1921, and it has since then been a cardinal tenet of Marxism-Leninism. Britain and America — still basically an Anglo-Saxon country — would do well to bear this long-term plan in mind. What is sought is their destruction.

Later, and in accordance with Lenin's dictum, the Russian Communist Party decided that the issue of race should be used as the tool to bring about the undoing of the Whites. This must have seemed a bold decision at the time, because Britain then dominated much of the world. Yet Lenin had at least one of the qualities of a great captain: he had studied his enemy very closely. His reasoning and tactics are set out at length for those who can endure the tedium of wading through his works. Briefly, he perceived very clearly that Anglo-Saxons do well on the battlefield, but poorly at the conference table. Therefore, they must never be allowed to fight — except amongst themselves — but must always be induced to talk.

Further, with their tradition of 'fair play', sympathy with the under-dog and desire for justice for all — except white South Africans, naturally — they were easily led to

harbour feelings of guilt and unease about their very natural disinclination to admit other races to their society. By playing on these artificially induced and quite unnecessary feelings of guilt, by fostering the myth of 'world opinion' and by publicising the idea that all men and all races are equal — without ever stating in what they are equal — it was easy to persuade the West to make concessions, each against its racial interests and each guaranteed to weaken it.

## FIGHTER

Yet war remains the ultimate argument, and the white man is a bonny fighter when roused. Also, all the white races who had had dealings with the Black were agreed upon one point: never must the Black be allowed access to White intoxicants or precision weapons. This view, based on hard experience of what an armed and drunken Black can do, was so widely held that the nations with African interests found no difficulty in agreeing to a treaty setting out these propositions, the so-called Congo-Basin Treaty, which was signed in Berlin. Until the Rhodesian debacle there had never been a peaceful takeover of a country by Marxism-Leninism. The Marxist-Leninists knew well that the eviction of the White from Africa could come about only by force of arms. Yet the Treaty of Berlin put formidable difficulties in the way of arming the Blacks. Therefore, the Treaty had to go.

Even the West, rotten with Socialism and Liberalism though it was, could hardly be expected to accept that the Black should be armed to enable him to evict the White. Since the real reason for desiring the abrogation of the Treaty of Berlin could not be given, as usual an acceptable ostensible reason was found. All of a sudden, men of goodwill everywhere simultaneously discovered that the laws which throughout black Africa banned the sale of ardent spirits to Blacks were 'discriminatory', and so of course abhorrent to every liberal and man of goodwill. These laws were, they said, morally indefensible, an insult to the 'emergent African', repugnant to the conscience of mankind (as if there was such a thing) and all the other egalitarian clichés with which we have had to become so tiresomely familiar.

*Contd. on next page*



So much hullabaloo was raised over the issue of European liquor that the Treaty of Berlin was eventually abrogated. In all the uproar nobody noticed, or nobody was allowed to say, that the abrogation made it possible for Blacks to be armed with precision weapons as well as drunk on European liquor. From that day the steady arming of Black dupes by their Communist manipulators has proceeded apace.

If anyone doubts that the object of Marxism-Leninism is to evict the white man rather than to confer 'freedom' on the Black, let him consider two simple facts. First, when two races occupy the same territory there are only a limited number of solutions to the problems which arise. Secondly, each of these solutions has been tried, has been weighed in the balance and found wanting by 'world opinion' and the exquisitely tender 'conscience of mankind'. This conscience is, of course, tender only when the white man can be held to be at fault. It is remarkably insensitive otherwise. Only three solutions are possible to inter-racial problems. They are: complete racial integration as attempted by the Portuguese in their African possessions and by Britain in England today; complete racial separation as embodied in the South African doctrine of separate development; or the wishy-washy compromise between the two which was the Rhodesian solution. There are no other possible solutions, short of genocide. This would, of course, be the African solution. One may note in passing that the government — but not the people — of Britain pride themselves on their multi-racial and integrated society: precisely what they condemned Portugal for doing for centuries. One must conclude, therefore, that what was under attack was not the political institutions of the white man, but the white man himself. Only South Africa remains 'in chains', and the next move must be her 'liberation'.

We may expect that the world-wide campaign against South Africa will intensify. 'Freedom fighters' will be further encouraged to act in 'Namibia', attempts to maintain law and order will be stigmatised as 'savage and brutally repressive', academics, clerics and men of goodwill will be encouraged to parade the scars in their selectively tender consciences inflicted by the horrors of the South African system. Fresh instances of the alleged horrors of apartheid will be brought daily to our unwilling attention. What we will never be told is that in South Africa the white man was there before the Black. Nor will we ever be told that the alleged horrors of apartheid are so attractive to the Black that tens of thousands of them enter the Republic illegally each year and resist all attempts to evict them. If this is true, as it is, it can only mean either

that Blacks are masochists to a man and enjoy being oppressed, or that, whatever 'world opinion' may say, separate development is not by any means repugnant to the Black. Nor will we ever be told the frank opinion of a Zulu about a Fingo, or a Matabele about a Korekore, and the resolute intention of each of these groups to have as little as possible to do with each other. This would conflict with the myth that all Blacks love each other, while only Whites have racial feelings.

Unfortunately the South African government, although not the people, seems to have conceded that it is defeated and confines itself to making right-wing noises while moving unobtrusively to the left. Most Whites are well aware of their danger and would support any steps necessary for their survival. We may be sure that they will not be allowed to take such steps or to evict a government which failed to take them. Specious reasons for the fatal inaction will be found, and the whole hellish chorus of myths which destroyed Rhodesia will again resound throughout South Africa to undermine resolution and to distract attention.

## REDUNDANT

Once South Africa has fallen, the views, needs and interests of the Black will cease to concern anyone. He will have served his purpose and will be redundant. Once this stage is reached, who needs the Black? In the attack on Australia which will follow the fall of South Africa the yellow man will be used, not the Black. In an increasingly complicated and technological world he is at a serious disadvantage. As a relatively unskilled labourer he could perhaps be of use in his own land for a while, but it is not necessary to use him. The Russians and Chinese have millions of far more industrious and intelligent slaves of their own. Further, by his

occupation of land the Black will be using space which his conquerors will need for their own people. All in all, his future seems to be short and bleak.

As soon as their services against the White are no longer needed, the flood of aid which has shielded the most incompetent races from the results of their own folly will dry up. No longer will grubby little black gangsters be permitted to masquerade as 'statesmen'. No longer will they be accorded a ready and sympathetic hearing by the media. They will in fact suffer the same censorship by smothering as does anyone today who attempts to voice a White racial viewpoint.

The American Negro may be in for a surprise too. Once his soul brothers in Africa have served their purpose and played their puppet part in the elimination of civilised rule, the views of the American Negro on African matters — or any other as well — become unimportant to both major political parties in the United States. He will find himself relegated to the obscurity from which he should never have been allowed to emerge.

As famine, tribal warfare and the anarchical incompetence of Africa take their toll we may expect a massive diminution in black numbers. The 'population explosion' in Africa could only happen because of the lunatic insistence of the white rulers on providing subsidised medical service for the Blacks, presumably to ensure that they would never run short of enemies. To destroy the Black, all it has ever been necessary to do is — nothing.

The black man's spell in the centre of the stage was brief indeed, hardly thirty years. It seems that he will now pass into obscurity and servitude, since nobody needs him any longer. One could almost feel sorry for him if one could forget the fearful things that have been done in his name and will yet be done before he passes into oblivion.

## APPEAL

We would like to thank all readers who responded to our appeal last month to help meet an unexpected tax bill. Taking into account the scale of donations we need to cope with normal monthly costs, there still remains a portion of this bill to be met. Donations please to Spearhead.

B. N. P. MEMBERS, wear your badges! Still only a small portion of the membership has bought the party badge. Price £1 each plus 25p p & p. From BNP, PO Box 457, London SE20 7QE.

Our magazine, though it believes in racial differences, opposes race-hatred. All those who oppose multi-racialism should attack the politicians who promote it, not the immigrants, who are merely its victims.

## BNP Indoor Rally LIVERPOOL

SPEAKER:

**John Tyndall**

THEME:

**GET BRITAIN BACK  
TO WORK**


SHAFTSBURY HOTEL  
28 MOUNT PLEASANT  
LIVERPOOL 3

**Sat., April 21st, 3 p.m.**



# THE ASSAULT ON TRADITION

**Ways in which Britain's heritage, culture and identity are being undermined, as seen by DAVID BALL**



**THE BRITISH PASSPORT**  
Destined for mothballs

fight hard to protect them; they are too precious to neglect, and if we do not cherish them no one else will. In Britain there has been a quite deliberate assault on tradition and custom from those who are determined to destroy our link with the past and pave the way for the subjugation of our people in a one-world conglomerate, leaving us forever enslaved in a form of living death. This may seem a serious charge to make, but let us now examine the evidence.

Firstly, let us look at the devices and measures that our forefathers devised in order to aid them in their everyday lives. Not least of these are the names they gave to the various parts of the country in which we live. After the local government butchery over which Mr. Heath so gleefully presided, the names of several historic counties disappeared from the maps of Britain: Monmouthshire, Westmorland, Cumberland and Rutland, to name a few. The county of Yorkshire and its Ridings (derived from the old Norse, meaning a third part) has been savaged, with the former East Riding bound in unholy alliance with North Lincolnshire to give us

'Humberside'. Even worse, the jealously guarded border between Yorkshire and Lancashire has been moved in places. We have the new Metropolitan counties: Greater Manchester, Tyne and Wear, Strathclyde, etc. It was all done in the name of "efficiency", yet we all know that the monoliths thus created are in fact a greater drain on our resources than those they supplanted. The practical effect in administration has been relatively slight, yet the cultural vandalism is beyond estimation. As a Yorkshireman born in the former East Riding, I feel this attack as a personal assault upon me, and I am far from being in a minority in feeling this. Yet our representatives of "democracy" choose to ignore the outcry because they know what an important link with our past has been broken.

At almost the same time as our traditional shire counties were being ravaged, the historic coinage of Britain was similarly coming under the axe of "progress". No longer do our pockets contain farthings, sixpences, shillings, florins or half-crowns, and the guinea is now but a memory. Instead we have 100 "pence" to the pound. In the years to come the reading of literature that uses the traditional currency will make the past seem even more distant. Indeed, Britain pre-1970 will almost seem a foreign nation, and thus our decimal currency will have helped to pave the way towards the one-world nightmare. How long will it be before we have a 'European' currency forced on us? The date is all too near, I fear.

## ENFORCED 'STANDARDISATION'

Now let us turn to a subject where a European standard has already been forced upon the British people, that of weights and measures. The story behind the ounce, the mile and the pint is as long and as historic as that involving our currency, yet in the space of half a generation a major and successful assault has been made upon them, again in the name of 'efficiency'. As someone who studied science at university, I fully realise that there is some truth in this, but this in no way justifies having to buy sugar

*Contd. on next page*

**THE TRADITIONS AND CUSTOMS** of a people do not spring up overnight but are the product of hundreds of years of gradual evolution. As such they are incredibly vulnerable to attack, for if one generation turns its back on this precious heritage a living link with the past is broken, all too often for good. So we must guard our connections with our ancestors jealously and

## Common Market madhouse

**THE COMMON MARKET**, one of the institutions keen on enforced standardisation in the name of 'efficiency', gets crazier and crazier by the year.

The latest of its lunatic schemes is one which will destroy a large part of what remains of Britain's dairy farming industry.

The Market bureaucrats have discovered that the EEC has a big milk surplus. How do they propose to cope with this surplus? Why, by issuing edicts to Europe's farmers that they must cut production. The nations worst affected are Britain (excluding Northern Ireland), Holland and Germany, who must carry out cuts of 7 per cent. France is less affected, being required to cut her production by 2 per cent. Ireland, on the other hand, has been allowed an increase of 4.65 per cent. For some reason Northern Ireland has been granted the same terms as her Southern neighbour.

The cuts mean that farmers on the British mainland must produce 200 million gallons of milk less every year. It is reckoned that this will lead to the slaughter of half a million dairy cattle and put 10,000 British dairy farmers out of business.

The absurdity of the whole situation is that Britain will still be importing vast quantities of dairy products from EEC countries, such as France, Germany, Holland and Denmark. We have to kill off our own cattle and ruin our own farmers in order to let in these imports!

It is about time they stopped calling it 'Common Market'. Common Madhouse is a better name.



in 1 kilogramme (2.205 pounds) packs instead of the good old two pound ones. Thankfully, the mile and the pint seem for the moment to be safe, but for how long will this be so? The youth of Britain have, for well over a decade now, been taught solely the standard metric measures and thus they have little or no knowledge of those our forefathers knew so well. How many of Britain's young understand the historic relationship between the inch, the foot, the yard and the furlong, or perhaps the ounce, the pound and the hundredweight? All too few, and so in a generation they will slowly pass into oblivion, becoming only vague reminders that kindle dull memories, much as Stonehenge does for us today.

The change in our monetary system and that of our weights and measures should not be considered separately, for they are closely linked. The time of both assaults upon our culture is remarkably similar, too much so to be a coincidence, and both have the same isolating effect between the future and the past, with all that implies.

Even the British passport, which for so long was virtually a total guarantee of safety (for it was well known that if a British subject was maltreated then the wrath of Britain would descend suddenly and unmercifully), is now under threat. This, too, will be superseded by a new European "standard", the EEC passport. Indeed the whole effect of being a member of the European Economic Community is destructive to our tradition. Its petty regulations have forced several changes to British law, changes that may seem trivial but whose cumulative effect is yet another nail in the coffin of the British heritage. But the biggest change has undoubtedly been the signing away of our sovereignty so that people in other lands now have a role in deciding what happens in our own society. Indeed, the changes in our laws are merely by-products of this betrayal of our nation.

This in fact is nothing short of treason, for what else can it be called when our people's destiny is handed over to foreign interests? Historic Britain is rapidly becoming no more than an outlying province of a United States of Europe, which probably serves as a prototype for the one-world nightmare which is gradually being forced upon us. Those in Parliament who had a hand in our absorption in this European monster conglomerate committed a treasonous act unparalleled in the annals of our history, and one day it is to be hoped that these betrayers of the British people will receive the traditional penalty for their crime.

## ATTACK ON CULTURE

Now let us turn to the assault on that less tangible part of our tradition, that which is called our folk culture. This is the very essence of our nation that, along with our blood, makes us what we are as a people: our traditions, superstitions, customs,

history, in short our whole way of life which has evolved slowly over the centuries. The attack on our folk culture has been massive and disastrous, and it now threatens to change our country irrevocably. The most obvious symptom has been the arrival into our land, that was once probably the most homogeneous in the world, of millions of people of alien race and culture. The customs and ways of life they have brought with them have impinged horrifically upon our culture. While their repatriation by a Nationalist Government would halt their growing influence, it will prove extremely hard to remove their cultural influence from Britain. Indeed it was probable that this was the main object behind the importation of these people. With the use of every means available, the alien way of life has been forced upon our people and, as unpalatable as it may be, we must face the fact that we can never again return to the once idyllic, totally British way of life. Perhaps this may be an advantage for us in the long term, for our aim will have to be a total national revolution, a veritable rebirth of our nation rather than minor cosmetic surgery. We shall be able to reinstate that which was good yet discard that which was previously unsound, along with the alien influences, in a great national purge. (We must not be afraid to use the word 'purge'; after all, its dictionary definition is "make physically or spiritually clean"). A total rebirth often proves easier to perform than the repair of a very shaky old order, so we may perhaps glean some measure of comfort from our position. That being said, it would have been far, far easier to remould our previously culturally homogeneous society.

It is not so much the source of the alien

influences that we should consider but the means that have been used to force them into our culture, and these can be summed up in two words: the media! Be it radio, cinema, newspapers or television, all have been taken over by Zionist forces, and are daily being used to pour forth slanders against the British people and the British way of life. They have indeed been mighty weapons used against us and for the designs of their masters. In the 1930s they were used to inflame the British people into a war with a country against whom we as a people had no quarrel. In the fifties they smoothed the way for the influx of millions of aliens. In the sixties they gloated over the destruction of the world's mightiest Empire. In the seventies they destroyed the growing strength of the National Front. They have pushed pornography, multi-racialism, militant feminism, Zionism, Communism, drugs, jungle music — the list is endless, and each attack has been yet another drop wearing away the bedrock of British culture. Inventions that could have been used to enrich and reinforce our heritage have instead become the mightiest tools in its destruction.

Today the British people walk around in a constant daze, for they now feel lost and isolated in the land of their forefathers. This is perhaps most easily seen in the faces of the older generation, who have known what it was like to live in a culturally homogeneous land. A large part of the younger generation turns to any distraction to ease its soul-destroying existence. Many of the symptoms of lawlessness and anarchy we see in our society are not merely the result of a lapse of the discipline within society; they are the visible signs of a people that has lost its sense of purpose in its journey through time.

## How to obtain SPEARHEAD

*Spearhead* is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick in box where applicable):—

British Isles: £8.00 ☐ Overseas unsealed surface mail: £8.55 ☐ Overseas sealed surface mail: £10.60 ☐

Unsealed air-mail Middle East: £11.50 ☐ Unsealed air-mail Canada, USA, South America and Africa: £13.10 ☐ Unsealed air-mail Australia, New Zealand, Far East: £14.00 ☐


Please note: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling; if remittance is in overseas currency, an additional charge of £3 is required in the case of cheques and 50p in the case of banknotes, these going to pay banker's commission.

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:—

10-19 copies: 40p ea.; 20-49 copies: 36p ea.; 50-99 copies: 30p ea.; 100-199 copies: 26p ea.; 200-400 copies: 22p ea.; 500 copies or over: 20p ea. (For advice on postal rates, please contact our office).

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: Seacroft, Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.





SIR: In your preamble to the article reprinted from *The South African Observer*, by Andries Treurnicht, leader of the Conservative Party (of South Africa), you write that it is "a very different party to the one in Britain by the same name." Really!

The fact is that the Conservative Party of South Africa has the same motives and serves the same aims as ours, namely to confuse, befuddle and 'con' the electorate whilst parading under a banner of patriotism and, in South Africa's case, white survival also. As the white electorate there are proving just as gullible and politically dumb as our own blockheads, the move by Treurnicht is proving a sound strategic one in the overall plan to 'con' the white South Africans into signing their own death warrant as a white nation. *Spearhead* seems to have forgotten that the split in the Nationalist party resulting in the formation of the Conservative party came roughly around the time the real hardliners in the HNP were beginning to make large electorate gains. Presenting himself as a hardliner on his past reputation as 'Dr. No', Treurnicht set himself up as the 'authentic' voice of white supremacy in the process of which he not only severely checked the progress of the HNP, even to the point of gathering in a substantial number of defectors from that admirable party, but served as a safe 'refuge' for the growing ranks of those disillusioned with the obvious sell-out policies of the Nationalists.

The fact that the Conservative party is now an accepted and integral part of the establishment, complete with the political 'respectability' that goes with it, not to speak of the very essential financial backing for those willing to play the part of 'phony' opposition, should be proof that Treurnicht and his crowd are anything but what they appear to be. Unfortunately, with an innocence which belies their long history of dealings with non-whites and the obvious fact of sheer incompatibility between the two races, the Whites in South Africa are falling headlong into the spider's web, of which Treurnicht is part and parcel.

The HNP, to its credit, offered the hand of political alliance and friendship to Treurnicht and his followers at the time of their defection from the Nationalists (just as John Tyndall has so often done to our fellow nationalists) but this was refused as the terms offered were under the trusted and quite honourable programme of the HNP. Naturally this was declined by Treurnicht as not only would it have put him beyond the pale of political respectability, with its loss of an assured income, but would necessarily have scotched the whole object of the exercise — that of creating a 'phony' but viable opposition to the Nationalists in the seemingly inexorable progress to black majority rule and the end of white South Africa.

J. N. NOBLE  
Grimsby, S. Humberside.

SIR: Having now got rid of the main cause of disunity between BNP and NF, it would be tragic if trivial differences of opinion/policy were to divide nationalists still when there is no division over the basic principles for which we all stand, namely the primacy of Race and Nationality, as so rightly pointed out by John Tyndall in your February issue.

When these fundamentals are at stake **nothing** else should matter. Nevertheless, commonsense does dictate that when unity is once more achieved, there is one important matter which must be treated with the utmost seriousness, which is at present ignored by the NF but which *Spearhead* has commented on in the past. This concerns members of the party who discredit the Nationalist image. After the disgraceful and oft-repeated events at the recent England-France football match it was suggested in the media and Parliament that the NF was behind this mindless and bestial behaviour. Whether true or false — and of course the media never miss an opportunity to discredit Nationalist parties — the 'facts' do however give credence to NF members having attended the match complete with NF banners and been involved in the rioting. With our knowledge of some of the membership recruits into the NF it would not be in the least surprising if the story were partially or wholly true.

J. D. M. TAYLOR,  
London W.11

SIR: Regarding the Queen's Christmas speech, it matters not who wrote it nor if she was badly advised. The relevant part was that she spoke those words. The theme will continue and probably get worse under King Charles.

The words must have reflected the Queen's views — years of touring the cosmopolitan Commonwealth and being surrounded by 'down with the barriers' advocates would affect all but a minority, and previous Christmas performances reinforce this.

This brings me to the question: Should the Monarchy be supported? In my view, no. A hereditary link is one thing but utterances against the survival of those people in whose land the Monarchy is based should put it beyond the pale. We are being enmeshed in a

global system with Buckingham Palace playing a part. Of course another Head could support its proper people but that morality is not the foundation of the Monarchy.

A. S. PAULIN,  
Romford, Essex.

SIR: On the perennial subject of the death penalty, I think the last word must lie with the French politician, Alphonse Kaas (I think that was his name) who said, apropos this theme in 1859, and I quote: "If we wish to abolish the death penalty, let our friends, the murderers, make the first move."

T. D. FOSTER,  
Schwabmünchen, W. Germany

SIR: I felt worried when I read Mr. L. A. Kernaghaus' letter in the January issue. It seems to me that he must have been listening to "The false teaching of the Modern Church" — the heading of a leaflet I still have, written by the Racial Preservation Society.

Anyway, I think he needs to be reminded that the Bible stresses in many different parts that the mixing of races is very wrong. At least, mine does. Hence: "Ye have transgressed and have taken strange wives to increase the trespass of Israel." "Now therefore make confession unto the Lord God of your fathers and do His pleasure; and separate yourselves from the people of the land and from the strange wives" (Ezra chapter 10, verses 10 and 11).

Anyway, there is now a Christian Affirmation Campaign, which is trying to point out some of the wrongs that the trendy church people are saying and doing these days. I am enclosing one of their newsletters. They are free, about three a year, but help with postage is appreciated.

(Mrs.) M. M. BUDD,  
Southall, Middlesex.

SIR: I wonder if the 'mole' Ray Hill, who is allegedly largely responsible for Channel 4's documentary "The Other Face of Terror", is the same "Ray Hill" who wrote "Propaganda Masquerading as History" in September 1983 *Spearhead*?

I shall be intrigued to see your comment on this in a future issue.

On the face of it, your choice of friends, whether they be queers or turncoats, is not impressive.

(Dr.) T. S. MORLEY,  
Douglas, I.O.M.

*Editor's note: Yes, it is the same Ray Hill. This affair is covered in a report on pages 16 and 20.*

SIR: At first the furore raised over The Queen's visit to Jordan seemed to be on account of fears for her safety. We later learned the real reason: it had profoundly displeased Britain's Jews!

R. EVANS  
Coventry



# IMPRESSIONS OF A TURNCOAT

*News of the World*  
hireling Ray Hill was  
welcomed, even liked,  
but never completely  
trusted, says  
**JOHN TYNDALL**

THOSE PERSONS who commit acts of treason come in a variety of types and have a variety of motives. This is so whether the treason is at the highest, national level or at lower levels such as that of treason to political party, cause or faith. Sometimes the act of treason or treachery may be long planned in advance and engaged in for totally genuine ideological reasons. In this case the would-be traitor would join the organisation he intended to subvert, having right from the start no objective other than to subvert it. Every action in which he engaged, and every profession of faith emanating from his lips, would have the purpose only of building and securing his credentials as a loyal servant of that organisation so that he may advance within it up the scale of seniority in order to do the greater damage when the moment for his ultimate act of betrayal came; his whole role within the organisation up to that moment, in other words, would be no more than an act, put on to conceal purposes which were entirely opposite to the ones he professed to be working for.

But in another case treason may have an entirely different cause, being rooted neither in strong ideological conviction nor in any great forward planning; it may be the product solely of a weak, unstable, corruptible and opportunistic character, liable to collapse and surrender itself to another's will under stress of circumstances — poor health, emotional upheaval, financial difficulties or inducements, or simple fear. In this case it could very well be that the betrayer had no advance intention of committing any act against the organisation he joined but, on the contrary, joined it and for a time served it out of quite sincere sympathy with its objectives and a genuine desire to promote those objectives. Because of some innate character deficiency, however, such a person is always liable to be 'turned', as the saying goes, if the pressures on his person make him see some advantage in turning. In some respects this type of betrayer can be more dangerous, precisely because the actions and words he employed to build confidence among his associates were perfectly genuinely motivated at the time they occurred, thus

conveying the sincerity of a stage or film actor who so absorbs himself in his allotted role that he actually starts to think and believe in the same manner as the one whose part he is playing.

It is with these considerations in mind that we should reflect on the latest act of treason within the Nationalist movement to attract the glare of media publicity: the 'exposures' made by Mr. Ray Hill, by way of courtesy of the *News of the World* and Channel Four TV.

My first acquaintance with Ray Hill that was more than a nodding one was a meeting the two of us had in a hotel lounge in London which had been agreed upon when we learned by correspondence of each other's interest in reunifying the warring Nationalist factions that had become splintered in 1979/80. He expressed his political convictions articulately, intelligently and, on the face of things, with some sincerity. He had a good sense of humour and it was easy to like him. We came to an agreement to collaborate as closely as possible, in particular in the field of Nationalist unity. Later, in fulfilment of part of our objectives in this regard, we joined together as colleagues in the newly formed British National Party.

## Warnings

At the time there were voices which urged me to have nothing to do with Ray Hill. I did not ignore them but indeed made a mental note of the warnings emanating from them. Neither did I rush wholeheartedly into acceptance of what they said; smear and counter-smear are a familiar feature of factional politics, and some of the sources from which the warnings came were themselves not deserving of the highest credibility. I weighed up what I had heard against Hill with my own personal observations and impressions. In order to give me an opportunity to pursue these observations and impressions further, my wife and I twice invited him and his family to stay some days with us at our home. As a result of this close contact, I came to the following conclusions:—

The first was that, if Ray Hill was a committed enemy of Nationalism and did not genuinely believe in its ideals, he put on an extremely convincing act to the contrary, indicating that, not only had he got off pat those ideas that lie at the surface of Nationalist thinking, but he had given his mind to some of the deeper philosophical questions that underpinned the Nationalist creed. As he expounded his view of these questions, it was extremely difficult even for a sceptic like me — ever on the watch for 'enemies within' — to believe that such views were not sincerely expressed.

The second impression was one of the possibility of some fundamental inner character flaw. I will not go into too heavy detail over the observations which led to this feeling, as to do so would involve the airing in public of private conversations and confidences in a manner which always causes me revulsion when I see the practice engaged in by others. Suffice it to say that I came to feel that Ray Hill was a person who, under pressure of circumstances different to the ones in which we had entered into amicable collaboration — circumstances possibly of great personal stress, perhaps intensified by financial pressure or blackmail, might be induced to act in a way that could cause harm to the cause in which he professed to believe.

It is quite possible to perceive such a flaw in someone while genuinely liking them, and there was, as I have indicated, much to like about Ray Hill, apart from appreciating that he had talents which, pointed in the right direction, could be of valuable service to our movement.

I discussed my feelings about Hill with some of my closest colleagues, and the consensus of opinion amongst us was that, while evidence against him was not sufficiently conclusive at the time for us to exclude him from the party, neither were the marks in his favour sufficient on balance for us to take him completely into our confidence or to regard him as one of the true 'inner circle' of trusted friends and confederates. He should be given scope in the party to exercise his talents but he should be given no position

*Contd. on page 20*



# EXPANSION OF ACTIVITY IN MANCHESTER

MANCHESTER AND LIVERPOOL, the two leading cities in North West England, are friendly rivals in much more than just football. Both have become strongholds of the British National Party and each is eager not to get left behind the other in activity and

growth.

Up till recently Liverpool Branch has made most of the running but in the last few months Manchester has been fast making up lost ground. The local BNP branch expanded considerably as a result of the 1983 General Election, the publicity of which brought in many new recruits. The best of these are now being trained for responsible roles in the party and the quality and volume of the branch's activity has increased accordingly.

The branch has of late devoted particular attention to newspaper sales, following

from Liverpool's example, and has established a strong presence in Manchester itself and in neighbouring areas like Stockport, where paper sales have recently been newly instituted. In Stockport in fact these sales have seriously upset local Reds, and there have been street confrontations between Reds and Nationalists similar to those that have occurred in Liverpool. The latest report we have from Manchester BNP is that the dignified behaviour of our own members in the face of yobbish left-wing provocation has made an excellent public impression and generated added support.

## GRAND SOCIAL

**CENTRAL LONDON**  
**Sat., May 5th, 7 p.m.**

*Rendezvous on Forecourt of  
Victoria Station: 6.30-7.30 p.m.*

with  
**DANCE BAND COMPETITIONS,  
RAFFLES.**

All Nationalists welcome

Tickets £3 each from  
Robin May, P.O. Box 123,  
London N8 7LQ—or at door

**BRING YOUR FRIENDS!**

## BNP Recordings

### RALLY '82

Speeches from the BNP national rally in London on October 16th 1982, the theme of which was 'Unite and fight for Britain's future!'

Side 1: Speeches by Charles Parker and Ray Hill; Side 2: Speech by John Tyndall.

### VOICES OF NATIONALISM

Side 1: Recordings of speeches from the Nationalist Unity rally in London on September 5th 1981. Hear John Tyndall, Ray Hill, Kenneth McKilliam, Len Bearsford Walker and others. Side 2: Talk by John Tyndall on 'The coming British revolution'.


### TYNDALL SPEAKS I

Side 1: Talk on 'Our Anglo-Saxon heritage' (about the world-wide dispersal of the peoples of British stock); Side 2: Talk on 'Britain's economic crisis'.

### TYNDALL SPEAKS II

Side 1: Talk on 'The case for Nationalism' (the internationalist argument demolished); Side 2: Talk on 'Tragedy of the 20th Century' (analysis of the results of the Second World War).

These 4 sets of recordings are presented in cassette form and are available at £3.50 each (with 17p postage) from: BNP Recordings, Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB.



### PAPER SALE IN STOCKPORT

l. to r. Jimmy Dunn, Alex Malcolm & Stephen Gemzala

## BNP Indoor Rally NORTH LONDON

**Friday, May 11th, 8 p.m.**

**SPEAKER:**

**John Tyndall**

**THEME: LONDON'S FUTURE: WHITE OR BLACK?**

*Rendezvous outside Arnos Grove Tube Station 7.30-8 p.m.*



## FOCUS ON THE BRANCHES

# Bradford

BRADFORD BRANCH of the British National Party has only in recent times become a unit in its own right; previously it could not be regarded as much more than an outpost of the neighbouring Leeds Branch. Now Bradford BNP is generating its own momentum and making a considerable impact in the locality.

Active Nationalism collapsed in Bradford with the demise of the National Front




GERRY ROBINSON

there in 1979. It was later revived through the work, first of Stewart Collins, and more latterly of Gerry Robinson, who has become the branch's new Organiser. Bradford Nationalists mainly affiliated to the New National Front when it was formed in 1980 and then later to the British National Party when the NNF and other groups merged under the BNP banner.

Gerry Robinson is 39 years old and a painter and decorator. He is married with three young sons. Over the past year or so he has worked tirelessly to build up the branch and force it into local prominence. For some time he was helped by reinforcements from Leeds provided by Mick Gibson, whose role in helping the branch he has asked us to acknowledge with thanks. Now Bradford BNP is starting to stand on its own feet, although close co-operation with Leeds Branch still continues.

The most important local issue in Bradford is the flooding of the area by Asian immigrants and their offspring and the appalling difficulties in local schools caused by this growing alien population. Tackling this issue head-on, the branch has led a campaign in support of racial segregation in schools pending the eventual resettlement of Britain's Asians and other unassimilable racial minorities overseas. The campaign has had the backing of a prominent local figure in education, Stanley Clayton-



STANLEY CLAYTON-GARNETT

Garnett, who was until his recent retirement Headmaster of Delf Hill Middle School in Bradford and is now Chairman of Leeds BNP. It is this campaign which, more than anything else, has made the BNP locally known and the object of growing interest in the area.

Other activists who have helped put Bradford BNP on the map have been Gerry Robinson's brother Andrew and Chris Parker. Bob Coupe has also been of great help to the branch. Although not BNP members, Mary Ramsden and Elsie Harrison have given valuable support as well.

## British Nationalist

You can obtain single copies of *British Nationalist* by paying a subscription of £3.40 for 12 issues (for subscribers in the British Isles). For subscribers overseas the rate is £4.00 for 12 issues (surface mail).

If you wish to obtain *British Nationalist* in bulk for redistribution, the rates are:-

10 copies	£1.20	+	32p	post
25 copies	£2.70	+	94p	post
50 copies	£4.80	+	£1.57	post
100 copies	£8.40	+	£1.90	post
150 copies	£12.00	+	£2.10	post
200 copies	£15.00	+	£2.25	post
300 copies	£21.00	+	£2.55	post
400 copies	£26.40	+	£2.80	post
500 copies	£32.00	)	Bulk rates	
1,000 copies	£62.00	)	by roadline	

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *British Nationalist*, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS. Please keep orders and enquiries for *British Nationalist* totally separate from other correspondence in order to avoid delay and confusion.

## PLEASE DONATE!

BECAUSE we of *Spearhead* speak our mind openly on the great issues of the day, without fear of what powerful interests we offend, our magazine is constantly short of money. We cannot persuade the large wholesale distributors to buy copies, and our income from advertising is tiny. We obtain distribution through postal subscriptions and by sales through the local branches of the British National Party, which we support. The revenue from these sources is nowhere near enough to enable us to meet our production costs at the present time.

This is why we urgently need regular donations from our readers and supporters — over and on top of what they pay for their copies. We hope that you will become one of these regular donors. Please send us what you can so that we can continue publishing our vital message.

We remind all those making donations that it is not our custom to send receipts automatically except for sums of £10 or over. This is in order to cut down on office work and postage. If, however, any donor of less than £10 should desire confirmation of receipt, would they please enclose an S.A.E. with their donation.

All contributions should be sent to *Spearhead*, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.



## IMPRESSIONS OF A TURNCOAT

(Contd. from page 17)

or role which might enable him to influence decisions or exercise responsibility or power; least of all should he be made privy to information of any highly confidential nature.

He was given the title of 'Publicity Officer', which under the terms which I explained to him meant no more than using his imagination to devise ways in which the party could make media headlines, and then to present his ideas on such matters to me for my decision. He was never, as claimed in the *News of the World*, my 'deputy'; in fact no such position exists in the Constitution of the BNP.

Shortly after the General Election of 1983, Ray Hill wrote and informed me of his resignation from the British National Party. On making some enquiries, I became confirmed in my feeling that some circumstances in his private life had induced this decision. He was, apparently, in some kind of trouble. We remained on friendly terms personally, but it occurred to me that the nature of the trouble affecting him suggested that it might stem from the character failings which I had suspected I perceived earlier.

I was not therefore wholly surprised when I read the *News of the World* on Sunday, March 25th. Having read it, I make no apologies for having accepted Ray Hill as a colleague to the degree that I did accept him. Organisations like our own cannot possibly grow if we set up an exclusive wall against all comers who do not produce for us a 100 per-cent security clearance, if we fail to exploit talents in the offing for constant fear that those talents might be flawed. It is all very well for certain people to pontificate to the contrary, but it is noticeable to me that those people have never undertaken them-

selves the work of building any political movement beyond the range of tiny drawing room clubs. An organisation which, within barely more than a year of its inauguration, is able to put up 54 candidates in a General Election pays an inevitable price for its growth and development: the price of risking that one or two rotten apples could get into the basket.

### Guard against infection

This business is not about keeping the rotten apples away, for that is a practical impossibility; it is about so organising and constituting ourselves that the rotten apples, if they get in, do not infect and destroy the basket as a whole. This involves, in terms of building a party, using careful discretion and discrimination in determining the degrees of initiation and confidence that one will extend to one recruit as against another. Such care is only possible in an organisation that is structured HIERARCHICALLY and in which decisions and appointments stem from the top. Even here there is no absolutely foolproof guarantee against infiltration, subversion and treachery, and I make no pretence to be offering it. What I can say is that the procedures I have outlined will drastically reduce both its probability and its effect.

In the event the harm Ray Hill did us was small, as can be seen in the fact that all the truly damaging information he came up with for the benefit of the *News of the World* and Channel Four involved people and groups not connected with the BNP. I am tempted to feel sorry for those people and groups but, if they think themselves aggrieved, they ought to ponder on their wisdom in allowing a character like Ray Hill to get so close to their operations — we never let him get too close to ours.

I suppose that what is galling is that I took Ray Hill into my home and treated

him as a friend, albeit a friend to be regarded with some inner circumspection. He sat at my wife's and my table and enjoyed our food and wine, and no effort was spared to make his and his family's two stays with us pleasant ones. Did he, as he received our hospitality, have treason and treachery in his mind? Still now I seriously question whether he did, but that does not reduce the revolting stench of that treason and treachery when it occurred.

I wonder if Ray Hill feels able to walk taller as a result of his recent actions. I wonder if he is able to look in the mirror in the morning without spewing his innards into the wash basin. I wonder if for the rest of his life he is able to proceed about his business without the impulse to look constantly over his shoulder. I ask these questions because I still do not believe that the man is wholly bad; somewhere in him there is a conscience, and it is not a conscience I would care to live with till the grave.

## 1984!

BRIAN CROPPER is deputy superintendent at the Philharmonic Hall in Liverpool. Last year he was mugged by a gang of Blacks. Then shortly afterwards he read a report in a newspaper about two Blacks who had attacked an old lady.

On the latter occasion he was sitting having a teabreak in the company of the hall's superintendent and the local convenor of his trade union. Disgusted at hearing of the lady's experience and recalling his own, he made a remark not wholly complimentary to the coloured immigrant community.

This was duly reported, and now the union, the General Municipal Boilermakers and Allied Trades Union, is demanding that he receive the sack, and to that end has ordered a picketing of the hall and a work to rule by its employees.

## Find out about the British National Party

Send 20p for information pack.

To:  
P.O. BOX 115  
HOVE  
E. SUSSEX BN3 3SB

Name.....

Address.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

I enclose.....